

## REMARKS

Claims 1-78 are pending in this Application. Applicant has amended the claims to define the claimed invention more particularly.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 11-15, 26-30, 41-45, 52-56, 63-67, 74, and 76-78 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, for at least the reasons discussed below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims herein are allowable.

Claims 68-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 68 to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1-6, 8, 16-21, 23, 31-36, 38, 46-47, 49, 57-58, 60, 68-69, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,332,025 B2, and hereinafter "Takahashi"), and further in view of Cedola, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,928,458 B2, and hereinafter "Cedola"). Claims 7, 22, 37, 48, 59, and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi, and Cedola, and further in view of Greenberg (U.S. Patent No. 7,171,651, and hereinafter "Greenberg"). Claims 9, 24, 39, 50, 61, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi, and Cedola, and further in view of Merrill (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0002943 A1, and hereinafter "Merrill"). Claims 10, 25, 40, 51, 62, and 73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill, and further in view of Elderidge, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,272,815 B1, and hereinafter "Elderidge"). Claim 75 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg, as applied to claim 70 above, and further in view of Christopher, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,437,156, and hereinafter "Christopher").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in the following discussion.

## **I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION**

The claimed invention (e.g., as defined by exemplary claim 1) is directed to an information processing system.

The information processing system includes an information processing server connected to a network that includes a server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to the information processing server for updating the plurality of objects, and at least one mobile terminal being connected to the network for transmitting an install request including an install list including the unique information and the URL of an object among the plural objects that is necessary for installation. The information processing server refers to the install list to select an object for transmission from the plural objects stored in the server storage device to transmit the selected object.

In a conventional information processing system, as described in the Background of the present Application, a download menu is requested to a server, using a terminal. A user of the terminal selects an object which the user is going to use from the download menu, using a terminal, and subsequently acquires the object (e.g., see Application at page 1, lines 12-16).

The claimed invention, however, provides an information processing system includes an information processing server connected to a network that includes a server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL for accessing to the information processing server for updating the plurality of objects (e.g., see Application at page 5, line 5-13).

This feature is important because the user only has to select the unique information and the URL of the needed object which is the object actually desired to be used. Thus, in the information processing system according to the present invention, there is no necessity of requesting a download menu (install menu) from the server, using a terminal, as in the conventional information processing system, so that the user is able to acquire the object promptly (e.g., see Application at page 5, line 25 – page 6, line 6).

## **II. 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION**

In rejecting claims 68-78, the Examiner alleges that claim 68 is indefinite for failing to

particularly point out the invention.

Applicant amended claim 68 to recite, “*information processing server according to claim 34,*” to define the claimed invention more particularly, consistent with the Examiner’s helpful suggestions.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### III. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

#### A. The Takahashi and Cedola reference rejection

In rejecting claims 1-6, 8, 16-21, 23, 31-36, 38, 46-47, 49, 57-58, 60, 68-69, and 71, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Takahashi with Cedola to render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Takahashi and Cedola do not teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

The Examiner alleges that Takahashi teaches the claimed server storage device. Specifically, the Examiner attempts to analogize the downloading from the server and URL of server, with the claimed updating the plurality of objects and URL of each object, respectively (e.g., see Office Action at page 6, lines 4-9).

Takahashi teaches that the alleged server merely downloads a software in response to a request (col. 5, lines 37-54). Takahashi, however, fails to teach or suggest that the plurality of objects are updated by accessing to the information processing server, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Furthermore, Takahashi teaches that the alleged server has an address information URL (col. 24, lines 1-2). Takahashi, however, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest that each object within the alleged server has a unique URL, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Indeed, the Examiner agrees that the claimed invention of claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34, states that each object within the server has a unique URL (e.g., see Office Action at page 2, section 4, lines 5-6). The Examiner, however, incorrectly bases his rejection upon column 24, lines 1-2 of Takahashi, which merely disclose a URL for the entire server, not uniquely for each individual objects within the server. Therefore, Takahashi fails to teach or suggest, in column 24, lines 1-2 (or anywhere else, for that matter), that each object within the alleged server has a unique URL, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Moreover, in rejecting claims 3, 18, and 33, the Examiner erroneously group the claims with claims 1, 16, and 31 and fails to address all the limitations in claims 3, 18, and 33. The Examiner only addresses the limitations in claim 1 and alleges that claims 3, 18, and 33 have the same limitations as claim 1 (see Office Action at pages 6 and 7).

Indeed, claim 3, and similarly claims 18 and 33, recites, “*said information processing server referring to said install list to select an object for transmission from said plural objects stored in said server storage device; said information processing server also referring to said installed list to form a list of unneeded objects, among the objects of said group of objects, said unneeded object being an objects which becomes unnecessary when said selected object has been installed on said terminal storage device, said information processing server sending said selected object and the list of unneeded objects to said mobile terminal*”. These limitations are not included in claim 1. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to address claims 3, 18, and 33.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specifically point out each feature of Takahashi and Cedola that he is relying on as allegedly teaching each feature of claims 3, 18, and 33 in the Application.

Moreover, Applicant submits that Cedola fails to make up the deficiencies of Takahashi.

Indeed, Cedola teaches a synchronizing data system between a first data store and a second data store (claim 11). Cedola, however, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects*,” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Cedola teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies on Cedola for allegedly teaching the mobile terminal (e.g., see. Office Action at page 6, last line).

Since Cedola does not overcome the deficiencies of Takahashi, the combination of references fails to render the rejected claims obvious.

Furthermore, the Examiner concedes that Takahashi does not teach a mobile terminal. The Examiner alleges that Cedola teaches the claimed mobile terminal (Office Action page 6, lines 20-21).

The Examiner bases his rejection upon claim 11 of Cedola and alleges that the reference teaches the claimed mobile terminal.

Indeed, the second data store of Cedola in claim 11 is in a different environment and has a different purpose and structure that the claimed mobile terminal and cannot be analogized with the claimed mobile terminal. Indeed, claim 11 of Cedola, upon which the Examiner relies on, fails to teach or suggest, “*at least one mobile terminal being connected to said network for transmitting an install request including an install list including said unique information and the URL of an object among said plural objects that is necessary for installation,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 3, 16, 18, 31, and 33.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi with the teachings of Cedola.

That is, Takahashi teaches a software distribution system for improving security, whereas Cedola discloses synchronized transfer between storages, which is not a related art with respect to Takahashi.

The Examiner applies a circular reasoning argument and alleges that the mobile device of Cedola can be combined with the teachings of Takahashi “*to expand the network connection to include wireless clients*” (emphasis added by Applicant) (Office Action at page 5, lines 16-19).

Applicant submits that adding the teachings of Cedola to the software downloading system of Takahashi would change the principle of operation of Takahashi, since the references teach two distinct systems that have different structures and are for different purposes and perform in different environments.

Since the alleged combination of the Takahashi with the teachings of Cedola would

not result in reasonable expectation of success, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined the references, as alleged by the Examiner.

Furthermore, in rejecting claims 2, 4, 17, 19, 32, and 34, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Takahashi with Cedola to render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Takahashi and Cedola do not teach or suggest, “*information processing server refers to said installed list to form a list of unneeded objects, among the objects of said group of objects, said unneeded object being an object which becomes unnecessary when said selected object has been installed on said terminal storage device, and sends said list of unneeded objects to said mobile terminal along with said selected object,” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in claim 2, and similarly recited in claims 4, 17, 19, 32, and 34.*

The Examiner’s rejection merely recites Applicant’s claim language with vague references to Cedola (e.g., see Office Action at page 7, line 17 – page 8, line 3). The Examiner, however, has not explained how Cedola applies to each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicant requests the Examiner to provide an explanation of how the teachings of Cedola apply to each and every feature of the claimed invention. That is, the Examiner is specifically requested to point out the features of Cedola (including reference number and specific passage) that the Examiner is analogizing to the features of the claimed invention, which recites, “*information processing server refers to said installed list to form a list of unneeded objects, among the objects of said group of objects, said unneeded object being an object which becomes unnecessary when said selected object has been installed on said terminal storage device, and sends said list of unneeded objects to said mobile terminal along with said selected object,” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in claim 2, and similarly recited in claims 4, 17, 19, 32, and 34.*

Indeed, Cedola is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest forming a list of unneeded objects and sending the list of unneeded objects to the mobile terminal, as recited in claims 2, and similarly recited in claims 4, 17, 19, 32, and 34.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one with ordinary skills in the art

would not have combined Takahashi with the teachings of Cedola, and even if combined, the alleged combination does not teach or suggest (or render obvious) each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**B. The Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg reference rejection**

In rejecting claims 7, 22, 37, 48, 59, and 70, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Takahashi and Cedola with Greenberg to render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg do not teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Takahashi and Cedola, as set forth above in section A, fail to teach or suggest this feature.

Moreover, Applicant submits that Greenberg fails to make up the deficiencies of Takahashi and Cedola.

Indeed, Greenberg teaches a remote control method and event generating process (col. 2, lines 14-27). Greenberg, however, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Greenberg teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies on Greenberg for allegedly teaching the event reporting (e.g., see. Office Action at page 12, lines 14-19).

Since Greenberg does not overcome the deficiencies of Takahashi and Cedola, the combination of references fails to render the rejected claims obvious.

Furthermore, applicant submits that Takahashi fails to teach or suggest, “*mobile terminal sends to said information processing server a recovery request, as said install request, for restoring the updated group of objects, installed in said terminal storage device, to said group of objects,*” as recited in claim 7, and similarly recited in claims 22, 37, 48, 59, and 70.

The Examiner relies on column 5, lines 37-43 of Takahashi, which previously he alleged for teaching the install request (Office Action at page 6, lines 4-7), and alleges that Takahashi teaches the claimed recovery request.

Indeed, Takahashi, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest, in column 5, lines 37-43 (or anywhere else, for that matter), that “*mobile terminal sends to said information processing server a recovery request, as said install request, for restoring the updated group of objects, installed in said terminal storage device, to said group of objects,*” as recited in claim 7, and similarly recited in claims 22, 37, 48, 59, and 70.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi and Cedola with the teachings of Greenberg.

That is, Takahashi teaches a software distribution system for improving security, Cedola discloses synchronized transfer between storages, whereas Greenberg teaches a remote control system, which is not an analogous art with respect to Takahashi and/or Cedola.

The Examiner applies a circular reasoning argument and alleges that the error reporting system of Greenberg can be combined with the teachings of Takahashi and Cedola “*to focus error reported*” (emphasis added by Applicant) (Office Action at page 13, lines 7-10).

Applicant submits that adding the teachings of Greenberg to the software downloading system of Takahashi and storage transfer system of Cedola would change the principle of operation of Takahashi and Cedola, since the references teach distinct systems that have different structures and are for different purposes and perform in different environments.

Since the alleged combination of the Takahashi and Cedola with the teachings of Greenberg would not result in reasonable expectation of success, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined the references, as alleged by the Examiner.



Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi and Cedola with the teachings of Greenberg, and even if combined, the alleged combination does not teach or suggest (or render obvious) each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**C. The Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill reference rejection**

In rejecting claims 9, 50, 24, 61, 39, and 72, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Takahashi and Cedola with Merrill to render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill do not teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Takahashi and Cedola, as set forth above in section A, fail to teach or suggest this feature.

Moreover, Applicant submits that Merrill fails to make up the deficiencies of Takahashi and Cedola.

Indeed, Merrill teaches a management server for download instructions (paragraph [0033]). Merrill, however, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Merrill teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies on Merrill for allegedly teaching downloading structures (e.g., see. Office Action at page 14, lines 1-4).

Since Merrill does not overcome the deficiencies of Takahashi and Cedola, the

combination of references fails to render the rejected claims obvious.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi and Cedola with the teachings of Merrill.

That is, Takahashi teaches a software distribution system for improving security, Cedola discloses synchronized transfer between storages, whereas Merrill teaches a system for configuration management of mobile devices, which is not an analogous art with respect to Takahashi and/or Cedola.

Applicant submits that adding the teachings of Merrill to the software downloading system of Takahashi and storage transfer system of Cedola would change the principle of operation of Takahashi and Cedola, since the references teach distinct systems that have different structures and are for different purposes and perform in different environments.

Since the alleged combination of the Takahashi and Cedola with the teachings of Merrill would not result in reasonable expectation of success, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined the references, as alleged by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi and Cedola with the teachings of Merrill, and even if combined, the alleged combination does not teach or suggest (or render obvious) each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**d. The Takahashi, Cedola, Merrill, and Eldridge reference rejection**

In rejecting claims 10, 51, 25, 62, 40, and 73, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill with Eldridge to render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Takahashi, Cedola, Merrill, and Eldridge do not teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects.*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as

recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill as set forth above in section C, fail to teach or suggest this feature.

Moreover, Applicant submits that Eldridge fails to make up the deficiencies of Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill.

Indeed, Eldridge teaches a system for discontinuing of installation upon a crash (col. 121, lines 35-45). Eldridge, however, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Eldridge teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies on Eldridge for allegedly teaching discontinuing of installation upon a crash (e.g., see. Office Action at page 15, lines 3-12).

Since Eldridge does not overcome the deficiencies of Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill, the combination of references fails to render the rejected claims obvious.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill with the teachings of Eldridge.

That is, Takahashi teaches a software distribution system for improving security, Cedola discloses synchronized transfer between storages, and Merrill teaches a system for configuration management of mobile devices, whereas Eldridge teaches a system for discontinuing of installation upon a crash, which is not an analogous art with respect to Takahashi, Cedola, and/or Merrill.

Applicant submits that adding the teachings of Eldridge to the software downloading system of Takahashi, storage transfer system of Cedola, and configuration management system of Merrill would change the principle of operation of Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill since the references teach distinct systems that have different structures and are for different purposes and perform in different environments.

Since the alleged combination of the Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill with the teachings of Eldridge would not result in reasonable expectation of success, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined the references, as alleged by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi, Cedola, and Merrill with the teachings of Eldridge, and even if combined, the alleged combination does not teach or suggest (or render obvious) each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**e. The Takahashi, Cedola, Greenberg, and Christopher reference rejection**

In rejecting claims 10, 51, 25, 62, 40, and 73, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg with Christopher to render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner and that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Takahashi, Cedola, Greenberg, and Christopher do not teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg as set forth above in section B, fail to teach or suggest this feature.

Moreover, Applicant submits that Christopher fails to make up the deficiencies of Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg.

Indeed, Christopher teaches generation of malfunction event report (col. 2, lines 9-29). Christopher, however, is silent about, and fails to teach or suggest, “*server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating said plurality of objects,*” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 4, 16, 19, 31, and 34.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Christopher teaches or suggests this feature. The Examiner merely relies on Christopher for allegedly teaching the generation of the malfunction event (e.g., see. Office Action at page 18, lines 3).

Since Christopher does not overcome the deficiencies of Takahashi, Cedola, and

Greenberg, the combination of references fails to render the rejected claims obvious.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg with the teachings of Christopher.

That is, Takahashi teaches a software distribution system for improving security, Cedola discloses synchronized transfer between storages, and Greenberg teaches a remote control method and event generating process, whereas Christopher teaches generation of malfunction event report, which is not an analogous art with respect to Takahashi, Cedola, and/or Greenberg.

Applicant submits that adding the teachings of Christopher to the software downloading system of Takahashi, storage transfer system of Cedola, and remote control device of Greenberg would change the principle of operation of Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg since the references teach distinct systems that have different structures and are for different purposes and perform in different environments.

Since the alleged combination of the Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg with the teachings of Christopher would not result in reasonable expectation of success, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined the references, as alleged by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one with ordinary skills in the art would not have combined Takahashi, Cedola, and Greenberg with the teachings of Christopher, and even if combined, the alleged combination does not teach or suggest (or render obvious) each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

#### **IV. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION**

Applicant has amended the claims in a manner believed responsive to the Examiner's claim objections, consistent with the Examiner helpful suggestions.

Regarding the Examiner's objections to claims 7, 22, 37, 48, 59, and 70, the Examiner is referred to claim 5 which recites, "*the deleted objects are stored in said terminal storage device*".

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-78, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above

application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 06.30.08



---

Farhad Shir, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 59,403

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.  
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
Customer No. 21254